



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,591	11/07/2001	Ran J. Flam	sparta01.005	4352
25247	7590	10/20/2004	EXAMINER	
GORDON E NELSON PATENT ATTORNEY, PC 57 CENTRAL ST PO BOX 782 ROWLEY, MA 01969			STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,591	FLAM, RAN J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert M Stevens	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are pending in Application No. 10/003,591, entitled "Graphical User Interface for Automated Process Control", filed 11/7/2001 by Flam. Claim 1 is independent.
2. No Information Disclosure Statement has been filed as of the date of this communication.

Priority

3. Although Applicant has claimed priority to earlier applications (09/930,698 [via CIP], which claims provisional priority to 60/225,532), Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Accordingly, the Office has denied Applicant's claim to domestic priority, and established the priority date of Application No. 10/003,591 as the date of its filing (i.e., 11/7/2001) for the purpose of examination.

Drawings

4. Applicant is reminded to refer to the accompanying form PTO-948 Notice of DraftsPerson's Patent Drawing Review.
5. Lead lines from the reference numbers to the referenced elements, as required by 37 CFR 1.84(q), are inconsistently used throughout the drawings. For example, refer to Fig. 12 (noting lack of lead lines for #1215, 1217, 1219, 1221 and 1201). Please correct all such inconsistencies.
6. The drawings are further objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 10 #1007, 1012; Fig. 14 #1415, 1418, 1419, 1421; and Fig. 16 #1615. Please correct all such omissions.
7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Fig. 17 #1715. Please correct all such omissions.

8. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c) and 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
claim 18 line 4 refers to "roll" (rather than role). Applicant is reminded to please correct all spelling/grammatical/etc. mistakes throughout the specification (including the claims and drawings).

10. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading and entry of amendments difficult. New application papers with lines double spaced on good quality paper are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claim 1: The language of this claim describes non-functional descriptive material. As such, this raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine, which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101.

One technique for satisfying the requirements of 35 USC 101 is to claim code residing in memory (i.e., hardware), wherein that code produces a tangible result.

Claims 2-19 are dependent upon claim 1 and do not add any limitations that would render these claims statutory under 35 USC 101. Therefore, these claims are likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

14. **Claims 1-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claims 1-19, there is no enablement as to the format/structure of the data structure (the record of the preamble of claim 1 and the fields/subfields populating this record) that is at the core of this invention. No figure appears in the specification depicting the data structure. Additionally, no passage in the specification provides a clear description of the data structure and the relationships between the fields/subfields

(for example - claim 1: field, first field, action fields; claim 2: identified fields; claim 9: reference field, reference field operation) of that data structure.

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In regards to claim 1, multiple uses of the term “field” is confusing, as “field” refers to different entities within this claim (e.g. “a field of a record”, “a field of an entry”, and “action fields”). Additionally, there is no nexus between a “window containing a table” and a field or a record. This claim is vague and indefinite.

Additionally regarding claim 1, there is a lack of antecedent basis as to “the field to be acted on” (refer to line 6).

Claims 2 - 19 are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore likewise rejected.

Also in regards to claim 9, the claim language is convoluted. It is unclear what field value is affecting what other field value, whether a user is setting only action fields or action fields and a reference field operation value, and whether “current” is before or after the user sets field value(s).

Claims 10-14 are dependent upon claim 9 and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. **Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Texier (US Patent No. 5,119,476, issued Jun. 2, 1992, hereafter referred to as “Texier”) in view of Schultz et al. (US Patent No. 5,812,133, issued Sep. 22, 1998, hereafter referred to as “Schultz”).

Regarding independent claim 1, Texier discloses:

A graphical user interface (Fig. 1) for specifying an action to be performed (Fig. 1 Base File re: “See/Modify Employee”) on a field of a record when a query

with which the action is associated returns the record (Fig. 1 Employee Information window), the graphical user interface comprising:

*a window containing a table wherein the field has an entry that is selectable by the user, (Fig. 1 Employee Information window)
the entry including
a first field that identifies the field to be acted on; (Fig. 1 Base File re: "New Employee") and*

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

one or more action fields that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action.

Schultz, though, discloses:

one or more action fields that, when the user has selected the entry, the user may set to specify the action (Fig. 5 "Task name" column)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

the identified field's values belong to one of a plurality of types; (Fig. 1 "Base File" window and col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu) and

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

the action fields in the entry are determined by the type of the identified field's values.

Schultz, though, discloses:

the action fields in the entry are determined by the type of the identified field's values. (Fig. 5 tasks 90-96 list actions to be performed on a particular system, the system name [e.g. System 1] being analogous to a first field)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

the plurality of types include types whose values belong to ordered sets that are defined in the system in which the graphical user interface is used (col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu), ... , and types whose values specify persons (Fig. 1 "Employee Information" window)

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

types whose values specify times

Schultz, though, discloses:

types whose values specify times (Fig. 5 re: condition column and watchdog column)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify that the identified field be cleared. (Fig. 1 "Base File" window, noting selection of New Employee to clear windows)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a value and to specify that the value be assigned to the identified field.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a value and to specify that the value be assigned to the identified field. (Fig. 5 watchdog column values for user tasks 90-96 were specified/assigned before they could be shown in table #88)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so

would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

wherein when the field's entry is selected, the user may set (Fig. 1 Base File window) ...

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

the action fields to specify an operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value which is the identified field's value when the record is returned.

Schultz, though, discloses:

the action fields to specify an operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value which is the identified field's value when the record is returned. (Fig. 5, computing an identified field [e.g., "Programs" field of #94, computed from value of "Condition" field], and col. 8 lines 45-56)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, the limitations of claim 6 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

wherein the field's value belongs to an ordered set of values; (Fig. 1 "Base File" window and col. 6 lines 16-20 discussing a menu) and

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values.

Schultz, though, discloses:

the user may set the action fields to specify an increment operation wherein the new value is a value that follows the identified field's current value in the ordered set of values. (Fig. 5 #100 and 98, specifying a system name field, which is analogous to a listing/ordered set of employees, as found in Texier))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned; (Fig. 1 "Base File" window for creation of a "New Employee" entry) and

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

the user may set the action fields to specify an action that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or an action that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value.

Schultz, though, discloses:

the user may set the action fields to specify an action that is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or an action that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value. (Fig. 5 "Condition" column allows a user to set values and "Programs" column shows conditional actions to be performed [especially noting task #94])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a reference field which is another field in the record and a reference field operation by which a new value for the identified field may be computed from a current value of the reference field which is the value that the reference field has when the record is returned.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein the user may set the action fields to specify a reference field which is another field in the record (Fig. 5 #94 "task name" field contains subfield [reference] value of "3") and a reference field operation (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" field) by which a new value for the identified field (Fig. 5 #94 "Program" field) may be computed from a current value of the reference field which is the value that the reference field has when the record is returned. (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" reference field value being "LS101=TRUE")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Texier also discloses:

wherein the identified field may have a null value when the record is returned; (Fig. 1 "Base File" window re: "New Employee" selection to empty or set field to NULL) and

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

the user may set the action fields to specify a first reference field and a first reference field operation is to be performed when the identified field has the null value and/or a second reference field and a second reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value.

Schultz, though, discloses:

the user may set the action fields to specify a first reference field and a first reference field operation is to be performed when the identified field has the null value (Fig. 5 #94 for "Condition" field value of "LS101=TRUE", "Program" field value indicates that performed operation is "CAN FILL") and/or a second reference field and a second reference field operation that is to be performed when the identified field does not have the null value (Fig. 5 #94 for "Condition" field value of "LS101=FALSE", "Program" field value indicates that performed operation is "CAN STOP").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 9, Texier discloses:

wherein the reference field operation assigns the current value of the reference field to the identified field. (Fig. 1 "Base File" window, re: "See/Modify Employee")

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the identified field and the reference field have time values; and
the user may further set the action fields to specify an amount of time by which the reference field's current value is increased or decreased to compute the new value for the identified field.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein the identified field and the reference field have time values; (Fig. 5 shows use of time values in "Condition" and "Watch Dog" fields for tasks 90-96) and
the user may further set the action fields to specify an amount of time by which the reference field's current value is increased or decreased to compute the new value for the identified field. (Fig. 5 #96 "Condition" field value = 20%)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 12, the limitations of claim 12 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify the amount of time in one of a plurality of ways.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify the amount of time in one of a plurality of ways. (Fig. 5 #94 "Condition" field can be set to one of a plurality of values [TRUE/FALSE], which accordingly affects the amount of time - as reflected in the "Watch Dog" field)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 13, the limitations of claim 13 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein one of the plurality of ways is days; and when days have been specified, the user may further set the action fields to specify whether the days will be computed as business days or calendar days.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein one of the plurality of ways is days; (Fig. 5 #90 "Watch Dog" field contains a time value. "Days" is, by way of analogy, a time value.) and

when days have been specified, the user may further set the action fields to specify whether the days will be computed as business days or calendar days. (Fig. 5 #90 "Watch Dog" field contains a time value. "Days" [whether calendar or business] is, by way of analogy, a time value.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 12, the limitations of claim 12 have been previously addressed.

However, Texier does not explicitly disclose:

wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record.

Schultz, though, discloses:

wherein one of the reference fields is a field whose value is always set to the current time when the query returns the record. (Fig. 7a #202 discloses the use of current time)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Schultz for the benefit of Texier, because to do so would allow a user to monitor a control program, including execution times, as taught by

Schultz in col. 3 lines 11-16. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., graphical monitoring/manipulation of stored records.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 1, Texier discloses:

wherein the identified field has a person value; (Fig. 1"Employee Information" window) and

the user may set the action fields to specify a role reference field from which a new person value for the identified field may be obtained, the role reference field referring to an ordered set of person values wherein one of the person values is a last-used person value and the role reference field obtaining the next person value following the last-used person value at the time the record is returned as the new person value for the identified field. (Fig. 1"Base File" window)

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 16, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to specify a person reference field that has a person value, the identified field being set from the value of the person reference field when the record is returned. (Fig. 1"Employee Information" window)

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent upon claim 17, Texier discloses:

wherein another action has been specified which assigns the person reference field a value from a role reference field; (Fig. 1"Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button) and
when the record is returned, actions which assign person fields values from roll [sic] reference fields are performed prior to other actions. (Fig. 1" Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button)

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent upon claim 16, Texier discloses:

wherein the user may further set the action fields to directly specify a person value, the identified field being set from the directly-specified

person value when the record is returned. (Fig. 1" Employee Information" window, including P7 validate button)

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

- Burk, Robin, et al., UNIX System Administrator's Edition, 2nd Edition, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, © 1997, pp. 181-184, 687 and 928-944.
- Gillespie, Richard, et al., PeopleSoft Developer's Handbook, McGraw-Hill Publishing, New York, NY, © 1999, pp. 21-24, 464-473 and 509-528.
- Deitel, H. M., et al., Java: How to Program, 2nd Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, © 1998, pp. 779-794 and 944-950.
- Jennings, Roger, Special Edition Using Access 97, 2nd Edition, Que Corp., Indianapolis, IN, © 1997, pp. 402-410, 443-447, 466-468, 828-831 and 844-846.

US Patent Application Publications

- Ramachandran et al US2003/0066032
Debard et al US2003/0177140

US Patents

- | | |
|---------------|-----------|
| Thurlow et al | 6,057,841 |
| Kojima et al | 6,384,848 |
| Hogan et al | 5,414,809 |
| King et al | 5,528,745 |
| Wolf et al | 5,546,525 |
| Zellweger | 5,630,125 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (703)

605-4367. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00 - 3:30. After mid-October 2004, the Examiner can be reached at (571) 272-4102.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can currently be reached on (703) 305-9792. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. However, note that the main number for Technology Center 2100 will be (571) 272-2100, as of mid-October 2004.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: October 14, 2004

rms



JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER